UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

FILED
2008 JUN 11 AM 10:49
CLERK US DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
BY RM DEPUTY

NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES

TO: ☑ U. S. DISTRICT JUDGE / ☐ U. S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE Houston
FROM: R. Mullin, Deputy Clerk RECEIVED DATE: 6/6/2008
CASE NO.: 08cv0374 JAH (BLM) DOCUMENT FILED BY: Petitioner
CASE TITLE: Haygood v. Knowles, et al
DOCUMENT ENTITLED: Objections to Report and Recommendation

Upon the submission of the attached document(s), the following discrepancies are noted:

✓	Local Rule	Discrepancy
☐	5.1	Missing time and date on motion and/or supporting documentation
☐	5.3	Document illegible or submitted on thermal facsimile paper
☐	**5.4**	**Document not filed electronically. Notice of Noncompliance already issued.**
☐	7.1 or 47.1	Date noticed for hearing not in compliance with rules/Document(s) are not timely
☐	7.1 or 47.1	Lacking memorandum of points and authorities in support as a separate document
☐	7.1 or 47.1	Briefs or memoranda exceed length restrictions
☐	7.1	Missing table of contents
☐	15.1	Amended pleading not complete in itself
☐	30.1	Depositions not accepted absent a court order
☐		Supplemental documents require court order
☐		Default Judgment in sum certain includes calculated interest
X		**OTHER: No original signature.**

Date forwarded: 6/9/2008

ORDER OF THE JUDGE / MAGISTRATE JUDGE

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

☐ The document is to be filed nunc pro tunc to date received.

☒ The document is NOT to be filed, but instead REJECTED. and it is ORDERED that the Clerk serve a copy of this order on all parties.

Rejected document to be returned to pro se or inmate? ☒ Yes. Court Copy retained by chambers ☐

* Petitioner may re-file his objections (with signature) on or before June 30, 2008

Counsel is advised that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules may lead to penalties pursuant to Local Rule 83.1

CHAMBERS OF: Houston

Dated: 6/9/08 By: C. Hill

cc: All Parties

K:\COMMON\FORMS\CIVCRM35.WPD
Form # Civ/Crim 35 (4/98) -- [Docuument Discrepancy / Court Order]

Darrow D. HAYGOOD V09189
C.S.P Sac IV New Folsom
P.O. Box 290066
Represa, ca 95671
IN pro se

REJECTED

United States District Court
Southern District OF California

D. HAYGOOD,

Petitioner,

V.

JAMES Walker, Warden,

Respondent.

case No. 08cv0374-JAH (BLM)

"Objections to Report and Recommendation"

On April, 2008, petitioner Darrow Haygood, a state prisoner appearing pro se and in Forma pauperis, Filed the First Amended petition For writ OF Habeas Corpus ("FAP") currently Before the Court. Doc. No. 4. In it's April 10, 2008 Notice Regarding possible Dismissal OF Petition For Failure to Exhaust state court Remedies (option order), This court inFormed petitioner that he had Failed to Allege exhaustion as to claims 1, 2, 4 and 6 OF the First Amended petition. Petitioner produces proof OF the Exhaustion OF State court Remedies as to claim's 1, and 2 as well as 4, and 6, starting with Superior ~~court~~ court, case No; in reference to 1 and 2 here is super. ct. No, SCE229595 Also in Regard's to 4 and 6, super. ct. No; SCE229595. Appellate Court Case Number, D049464, Also in Regard's to 4, and 6, Appellate Court case number, D043134. And Supreme Court Case number, S155796